

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-13, 15-25 and 27-37 remain in the application for further prosecution. Claims 1, 10, 12, 25 and 27-36 have been amended. Claims 14 and 26 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 27 and 30-36 were objected to as having improper dependency. Applicant has amended these claims to be properly dependent.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 102 & § 103

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 12-18, 25, 27-29, 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,186,894 ("Mayeroff").

Claims 3, 6, 17, 30 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayerhoff, in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,029,395 ("Baerlocher").

Interview Summary

The Applicant notes with appreciation the interview conducted with Examiners Hylinski and Hotaling on July 9, 2008. In the Interview, applicant reviewed the features of the claims and specifically the side wager feature in view of the cited Mayeroff reference. Applicant agrees with the interview summary sheet provided by the Examiner. The Examiner agreed to reconsider claim amendments to further define the side wager element in view of Mayeroff.

Claim Amendments

As noted in the Interview, Mayeroff does not allow a separate side wager as the player merely allocates the basic wager made to different numbers of possible paylines. The player does not add to the basic wager, the payoff buttons 61-65 in Fig. 1 of Mayeroff cited by the Office Action merely allow the selection of different numbers of paylines to allocate the basic

wager. (Col. 5, l. 65 to Col. 6, l. 4). In contrast, the side wager in the present claims is a truly separate wager that differs from the basic amount in that the side wager is an amount that is wagered by the player in addition to the amount of the basic wager. The Office Action and Interview summary assert that the payline selection in Mayeroff could be construed as a side wager because a wager implies not only the value of the bet but also the occurrence the bet will be resolved against and there is an increase in the probability of payoffs when more paylines are played as in Mayeroff.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action's assertion that Mayeroff allows a separate side wager as required by the claims in the present application. Mayeroff only allows a single wager that a player may then have the option of allocating among different paylines via the selection buttons 61-65. The wagering on different paylines is not a side wager, it is simply part of the basic wager. Mayeroff does not disclose a side wager and therefore does not anticipate the claims.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 12, 25 and 28-29 to further define the side wager as an additional wager from the basic wager and "the side-wager option requiring a side-wager amount in addition to the accepted basic wager." Mayeroff does not disclose nor suggest this element as the buttons 61-65 only allow allocation of the basic wager among paylines if the basic wager is accepted from a player and therefore does not require an amount in addition to the accepted basic wager. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 10, 12, 25 and 28-29 and their dependents are allowable over Mayeroff.

Conclusion

It is Applicant's belief that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance and actions towards that effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any matters which may be resolved or clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the number indicated.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 25, 2008

/Wayne L. TANG, Reg. #36028/
Wayne L. Tang
NIXON PEABODY, LLP.
161 N. Clark Street, 48th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601-3213
(312) 425-3900
Attorney for Applicants